

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on May 16, 2005. In light of the amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 15-30, 32-35, and 37-41 are currently pending in this application, with claims 15, 33, and 40 being independent.

*No new matter has been added.*

**Drawing objections**

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action includes an objection to the drawings. In particular, the Office Action contends that the drawings do not show features of the invention as specified in claims 27, 28, and 32. This objection is traversed.

An output jack is shown in the drawings as element 5 (specification at Figure 2A). As described at page 6, lines 31-34, of the written description, this output jack 5 may be for an audio output or a modem output ("... the electrical output jacks 5 typically include an audio output to accommodate a cord and plug 3 connected to a speaker, but can reasonably include a modem output or other communicative means").

Thus, the drawings show an "audio output" as recited in claim 27 and the "modem output" as recited in claim 28.

Further, arrow 12 in Figure 1 illustrates a wireless communication as described at page 6, line 19, of the written description ("... wireless transmission is exemplified by arrow 12 of FIGURE 1"). The drawings therefore recite a wireless transferring as recited in claim 32.

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 15-30, 33-35 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in which the Office Action contends that the claims are indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner maintains that the terms “accepting” and “enclosing” are not clearly distinguishable.

Applicants thank the Examiner for suggesting alternative language, and they respectfully maintain that the terms “accepting” and “enclosing” as recited in the claims are distinguishable.

Page 5, lines 6-9, of the specification provides that a carrying case according to a simple embodiment of the present invention is shown in the accepting position in FIG. 2a, and in the enclosing position in FIG. 2b. Page 5, lines 9-10, of the specification provides that a portable electronic device is accepted in a pocket portion of the case as shown in FIG. 2a. Page 5, lines 10-11, of the specification provides that FIG. 2b shows the case enclosing the electronic device.

Read in light of the specification and in reference to the drawings, Applicants believe the meaning of the terms “accepting” and “enclosing” as recited in the claims is clear.

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because it depends from a cancelled claim.

Applicants have amended claim 32 to depend from pending independent claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 15-19, 21, 23, 33-35 and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,006,764 to Yamamoto et al. (Yamamoto) and U.S. Patent No. 5,325,139 to Matsumoto.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 20, 22, 24-27 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Yamamoto, Matsumoto, and U.S. Patent No. 6,657,654 to Narayanaswami. Page 7 of the Office Action also includes a rejection of claims 28-30.

These rejections are traversed at least for the following reasons.

First, Applicants argue that their claims are patentable over Yamamoto and Matsumoto because the combination of these two references does not disclose or suggest all elements of independent claims 15, 33, and 40. Accordingly, the combination of Yamamoto and Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest elements recited in dependent claims 16-19, 21, 23, 34, 35, and 41.

Second, Applicants argue that their claims are patentable over Yamamoto, Matsumoto, and Narayanaswami because the combination of these three references does not disclose or suggest all elements of independent claims 15 and 33. Accordingly, dependent claims 20, 22, 24-27, and 37-39 are patentable over the combination of these three references as well.

**Yamamoto** teaches a protection case 5 for a tape-recorder 1. The top part and one of the side parts of case 5 can be opened so that the tape recorder 1 can be freely inserted and taken out (Yamamoto at column 1, lines 63-65). On protection case 5, important parts, through which important controlling and indicating parts are to be seen, are made transparent in a window fashion (Yamamoto at column 3, lines 21-24).

Applicants agree with the Examiner's statement that the protective material of Yamamoto does not explicitly include a controlling interface (Office Action at page 4).

Applicants argue that the Office Action fails to show within Yamamoto the features found within independent claim 15 of *a controlling interface for handling electrical signals, said controlling interface having exterior user controls disposed on said protective material for manipulation by a user of said electronic device, said electronic device maintained within said case being controllable by said electrical signals from said exterior user controls.*

Moreover, the Office Action fails to show within Yamamoto either the act found within independent claim 33 of *disposing exterior user controls of a controlling interface on said case*, or the act found within claim 33 of *transferring electrical signals between said electronic device and said controlling interface.*

Additionally, the Office Action fails to show within Yamamoto the features found within independent claim 40 of *a controlling interface for handling electrical signals, said controlling interface having exterior user controls disposed on said protective material for manipulation by a user of said electronic device, said electronic device enclosed within said case being controllable by said electrical signals from said exterior user controls.*

Matsumoto has been cited in the Office Action for the features deficient within Yamamoto. Matsumoto teaches a photographic film unit 2 and a transparent plastic housing body 3 (Matsumoto at figures 1 and 2, and column 2, lines 60-62). Matsumoto teaches that in the opening 22 is fitted a shutter depressing member 24 to be manually pushed down for depressing the shutter button 12 (Matsumoto at column 3, lines 31-34). Matsumoto further teaches a manually operable knob 29, wherein on the shaft 28a are fixed a coupling gear 28 and the operable knob 29 (Matsumoto at column 3, lines 44-46).

Nevertheless, regarding independent claims 15 and 40, Matsumoto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the photographic film unit 2 being controllable by *electrical signals* from either the shutter depressing member 24 or the knob 29.

Matsumoto also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest user control circuitry for transferring said electrical signals between said electronic device and said controlling interface, said user control circuitry being mounted within said protective material.

As a result, the Office Action fails to show within Matsumoto the features found within claim 15 of *a controlling interface for handling electrical signals, said controlling interface having exterior user controls disposed on said protective material for manipulation by a user of said electronic device, said electronic device maintained within said case being controllable by said electrical signals from said exterior user controls.*

Additionally, the Office Action fails to show within Matsumoto the feature found within claim 40 of *a controlling interface for handling electrical signals, said controlling interface having exterior user controls disposed on said protective material for manipulation by a user of said electronic device, said electronic device enclosed within said case being controllable by said electrical signals from said exterior user controls.*

Regarding claim 33, Matsumoto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest using *electrical signals* from either the shutter depressing member 24 or the knob 29 to control the photographic film unit 2.

As a result, the Office Action fails to show within Matsumoto either the step found within claim 33 of transferring *electrical signals* between said electronic device and said controlling interface, or the step found within claim 33 of using *said electrical signals* from said exterior user controls *to control said electronic device enclosed within said case.*

**Narayanaswami** arguably teaches a personal digital assistant 100 and a cradle 112 (Narayanaswami at figure 2 and 6, column 4, line 12). Cradle 112 of Narayanaswami is arguably provided with camera controls such as a shutter release 118, a zoom control 120, and flash mode controls 124 (Narayanaswami at column 4, lines 28-30).

Regarding independent claims 15 and 40, Narayanaswami fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the personal digital assistant 100 received by the cradle 112 being controllable by electrical signals from the camera controls. Narayanaswami also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest user control circuitry for transferring said electrical signals between said electronic device and said controlling interface, said user control circuitry being mounted within said protective material.

As a result, the Office Action fails to show within Narayanaswami the feature found within claim 15 of *a controlling interface for handling electrical signals, said controlling interface having exterior user controls disposed on said protective material for manipulation by a user of said electronic device, said electronic device maintained within said case being controllable by said electrical signals from said exterior user controls.*

Additionally, the Office Action fails to show within Narayanaswami the feature found within claim 40 of *a controlling interface for handling electrical signals, said controlling interface having exterior user controls disposed on said protective material for manipulation by a user of said electronic device, said electronic device enclosed within said case being controllable by said electrical signals from said exterior user controls.*

Regarding claim 33, Narayanaswami fails to disclose, teach, or suggest using electrical signals from the camera controls to control the personal digital assistant 100 received by the cradle 112.

As a result, the Office Action fails to show within Narayanaswami either the step found within claim 33 of transferring electrical signals between said electronic device and said controlling interface, or the step found within claim 33 of using said electrical signals from said exterior user controls to control said electronic device enclosed within said case.

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

### **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that would speed prosecution of this application, Applicants request the Examiner telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753 or the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Dated: August 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kahanen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant